



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,232	01/14/2002	Krzysztof Chwalisz	SCH 1537 D2	7422

23599 7590 09/20/2004

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.
SUITE 1400
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

TRAVERS, RUSSELL S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/043,232

Applicant(s)

CHWALISZ ET AL.

Examiner

Russell Travers, J.D., Ph.D

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14, 33-35 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14, 33-35 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

The request for continuing examination filed July 19, 2004 has been received and entered into the file.

Applicant's arguments filed September 25, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Claims 12-14, 33-35 and 48 are presented for examination.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,

- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth criteria that defines neither various compound classes encompassing those medicaments possessing anti-progestin activity, nor sets forth a set of compound examples enabling the skilled artisan to envision those compounds suitable to practice the invention as claimed. Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, Applicants have set forth few medicaments possessing anti-progestin activity as compound examples failing thereby to enable the instant specification by reciting sufficient working examples. To envision compounds recited functionally, the skilled artisan must be provided great numbers of compounds residing in those compound classes envisioned thereby providing guidance as to those compounds suitable to practice the invention as claimed. In the instant case Applicants have not met this burden, by failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all medicaments possessing anti-progestin activity, necessitating an exhaustive search for

Art Unit: 1617

the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Claims 12, 14, 33, 35 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 12-14, 33-35 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Garfield et al and Teutsch et al.

Garfield et al and Teutsch et al teach the claimed compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in dosage

forms. These medicament are taught as useful for controlling fertility. Claims 12-14, 33-35 and 48, and the primary references, differ as to:

- 1) the concomitant employment of these medicaments, and
- 2) administration of the medicaments post-coitally.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of conventional anti-fertility agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

Garfield et al teach the various claimed nitric oxide synthetase inhibitors, to include L-NAME, as useful for controlling fertility (see column 7). Teutsch et al teach the claimed mifepistone as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in dosage forms. This medicament is taught as useful for controlling fertility, specifically implantation (see column 57). These medicament are taught individually as useful for controlling fertility.

Claims 14 and 35 specifically requires administration of pharmaceutical compositions post-coitally. Fertilization and implantation, an indispensable step in reproduction, are only complete 9-10 days post-coitus: a fact well known to the skilled artisan, and easily substantiated by perusal of any basic text book. Possessing this

Art Unit: 1617

information the skilled artisan would be motivated to employ the claimed compounds post-ciotally and enjoy a reasonable expectation of therapeutic success. The skilled artisan would have seen conventional pharmaceutical compositions, and the administration of these compounds by conventional means as residing in the skilled artisan purview.

Examiner would favorably consider claims directed to those medicaments providing unexpected therapeutic benefits, as averred herein.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Applicants' arguments presented to rebut the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph are unconvincing. Active ingredients, functionally calmed, place the burden to identify such compounds on those individuals seeking to practice the claimed invention. Thus, to set forth envisioned active ingredients only by function places a burden of undue experimentation on those seeking to practice the envisioned invention.

Attention is directed to *General Electric Company v. Wabash Appliance Corporation et al* 37 USPQ 466 (US 1938), at 469, speaking to functional language at the point of novelty as herein employed: "the vice of a functional claim exists not only when a claims is "wholly" functional, if that is ever true, but when the inventor is painstaking when he recites what has already been seen, and then uses conveniently functional language at the exact point of novelty". Functional language at the point of novelty, as herein employed by Applicants, is further admonished in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* 43 USPQ2d 1398 (CAFC 1997) at 1406: stating this usage

Art Unit: 1617

does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the recited invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate". Applicants functional language at the point of novelty fails to meet the requirements set forth under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claims employing functional language at the point of novelty, such as Applicants', neither provide those elements required to practice the inventions, nor "inform the public during the life of the patent of the limits of the monopoly asserted" *General Electric Company v. Wabash Appliance Corporation et supra*, at 468. Claims thus constructed provide no guidance as to medicaments employed, levels for providing therapeutic benefit, or provide notice for those practicing in the art, limits of protection. Simply stated, the presented claims are an invitation to experiment, not reciting a specific medicament regimen useful for practicing the instant invention.

Rebuttal arguments presented have failed to convince Examiner the presented claims are unobvious. As stated in the office action filed April 23, 2003, the claimed ingredients are well known individually for the purpose herein envisioned: contraception. To combine two therapeutic agents well known for possessing such contraceptive activity is neither "hindsight", nor an "invitation to experiment". Use in the prior art for the same therapeutic goal serves to motivate the skilled artisan to employ these therapeutic agents concomitantly, rendering the instant claims properly rejected as obvious over the prior art of record.

Applicants aver unexpected benefits residing in the claimed subject matter, yet fail to set forth evidence substantiating this belief. Evidence as to unexpected benefits must be "clear and convincing" *In re Lohr*, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA 1963), and be of a

scope reasonably commensurate with the scope of the subject matter claimed, *In re Linder*, 173 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1972). The data provided by Applicants is not clear, convincing, nor reasonably commensurate in scope with the instant claims. Absent claims commensurate with the showing of unexpected benefits, or a clear and convincing showing reasonably commensurate with the instant claims, such claims remain properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

It is well known by the skilled artisan that carriers and excipients are employed to enhance the activity of active ingredients. Thus, the skilled artisan would expect conventional excipients and carriers to be useful concomitantly, absent information to the contrary. The instant carriers and excipients are not employed concomitantly in the prior art, thus only obviate their concomitant use.

Applicant's attention is drawn to In re Graf, 145 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1965) and In re Finsterwalder, 168 USPQ 530 (CCPA 1971) where the court ruled that when a substance is unpatentable under 35 USC 103, it is immaterial that applicant may have disclosed an obvious or unobvious further purpose or advantage for the substance.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell Travers, J.D., Ph.D whose telephone number is 571-272-0631. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax

Art Unit: 1617

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Russell Travers, J.D, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617